REMARKS

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action, and amended as necessary to more clearly and particularly describe the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite with regard to the limitation "said fiber (2) possibly being subjected to at least one mechanical stress" in claim 1. Claim 1 has been amended to require that "said clamping device being adapted to resist a tension force," which is sufficiently definite for purposes of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Thus, the rejection has been rendered moot by the amendment and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 5-10 were objected to under 37 CFR § 1.75(c) as being in improper form due to improper multiple dependencies. Claims 5-10 have been amended appropriately to obviate the objection.

Claims 1-4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 4,848,870 to Wisecarver et al. (hereinafter "Wisecarver") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,002,359 to Sayegh (hereinafter "Sayegh"). Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly distinguish from the prior art. Further, for the following reasons the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Regarding amended claim 1, neither Wisecarver nor Sayegh, nor any combination thereof, teaches or suggests a "clamping device being adapted to resist a tension force having a value exceeding 5 N exerted along a longitudinal axis of said fiber," as required. Wisecarver

does not teach or suggest that its clamping device is adapted to resist such a tension force. Further, as described at column 5, lines 31-33, the embodiment of Fig. 5 of Wisecarver is intended for use as a connector in a patch panel. Similarly, at column 6, lines 7-10, Wisecarver describes an embodiment of its invention as shown in Figs. 6 and 7, which is useful in an exposed connector panel. One of ordinary skill in the art will appreciate that connectors used in patch panels and connector panels as described in Wisecarver would not need to resist tension forces exceeding 5 N, as presently claimed. Since Sayegh does not teach a clamping device, modifying Wisecarver based on the teachings of Sayegh would still not result in the claimed clamping device that is adapted to resist a tension force having a value exceeding 5 N, as claimed. Therefore, since every limitation of amended claim 1 is not taught or suggested by the combination of cited references, claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-10 are patentable over to prior art of record.

Further regarding claim 1, neither Wisecarver nor Sayegh, nor a combination thereof, teaches or suggests that "only part of *each end portion* (18, 20, 118, 120) *is in contact with the mechanically deformable cladding* (22) of the fiber (2)," as required. The Examiner cites the flat surfaces (12) of the jaws (2) as the end portions required by claim 1. As shown in Figs. 1 and 2 of Wisecarver, these flat surfaces (12) do not make any contact with the cladding of either of the fibers (17, 18). Rather, as disclosed, the cladding of each respective fiber (17, 18) is held only by the jaw flat surfaces (8) of the jaws (2). Thus, the flat surfaces (12) of Wisecarver cannot by the end portions required by claim 1. Since Sayegh does not teach any jaws, it cannot be relied upon to teach or suggest required end portions of claim 1 of which Wisecarver is

deficient. Therefore, since neither reference teaches the end portions as claimed, even if Wisecarver and Sayegh are combined every limitation of claim 1 would not be taught or suggested.

Since, for the above reasons, every limitation of claim 1 is not taught or suggested by the cited references, claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-10 are patentable over the prior art of record.

Further, with reference to claim 2, neither Wisecarver nor Sayegh, nor any combination thereof, teaches or suggests that "for each jaw (4), *the end portions* (118, 120) *are surfaces* for which a section defined by any plane passing through the main axis (6) of the device (1) is a line segment," as required. As explained above, the flat surfaces (8) of the jaws (2) taught by Wisecarver do not make contact with the cladding of either of the fibers (17, 18) as required by claim 1. Claim 2 clearly requires that the claimed end portions, which must contact the cladding, are *flat surfaces*, and not merely some arbitrary end portions of the jaws. Thus, since Wisecarver does not teach that a part of each flat end surface (8) of the jaws (2) is in contact with the cladding of the fibers (17, 18), and since Sayegh does not teach jaws, the combination of these references clearly does not teach or suggest every limitation of claim 2. Thus, for this additional reason, claim 2 is patentable over the prior art of record.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. 37308.

Respectfully submitted,

PEARNE & GORDON LLP

By: /Aaron A. Fishman/
Aaron A. Fishman – Reg. No. 44,682

1801 East 9th Street
Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108
(216) 579-1700

Date: July 10, 2006